

MS#180500.03 (4947.2)
PATENT**REMARKS**

Applicant has thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the June 23, 2004 Office action. Claims 42-57, 60-63, and 65-68 are presented in the application for further examination. Claims 42, 60, and 65 have been amended by this Amendment E to more clearly set forth the present invention. Reconsideration of the application claims as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested. The following remarks will follow the sequence of the Office action.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his time during an interview with the undersigned on January 26, 2005. Although no agreement was reached during the interview, the Examiner suggested that the above amendments appear to distinguish over the applied art and that a further search would be required. It is noted that Applicants have filed a request for continued examination with this Amendment E.

Claims 42-69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaPorta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,429) in view of Bartholomew et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,215,858).

With regard to claim 42, the Office action states that the LaPorta reference in combination with the Bartholomew reference teach each and every element. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, Applicant submits that neither the LaPorta reference nor the Bartholomew reference teaches or discloses a message router which parses recipient addresses. In particular, claim 42 has been amended to recite "a message router, configured to parse recipient addresses received in the broadcast message from the sending device." See Fig. 6 and reference character 612 as an illustration of this aspect of the invention.

The LaPorta reference is directed to a two-way wireless messaging system with a transaction server. The LaPorta reference states:

A message can be delivered through a public switched telephone network 16 that includes a network access switch 19 connected to a telephone 22 by a first communication coupling through a twisted pair line, co-axial cable, fiber optic line, wireless link or any other type of communication coupling. The messaging

MS#180500.03 (4947.2)
PATENT

network 14 can also be connected to a cellular network 24 or data network 26 for transporting E-mail messages 27 to a desired destination such as a personal computer at a desired time. Additionally, messages could be forwarded to a destination through the world-wide web 27a.

(LaPorta et al., col. 4, line 62 to col. 5, line 5)

As can be seen, the LaPorta reference teaches that if a receiving device is a computer, then the two-way messaging system sends a message via a server to the receiving device over a data network. The LaPorta reference also teaches that if a receiving device is a telephone, then the two-way messaging system sends a message via a server to the receiving device over a public switched telephone network. However, the LaPorta reference fails to teach or disclose that a broadcast message is routed *via a parsing router* to the receiving device. In particular, the LaPorta reference fails to teach or disclose a message router, configured to parse recipient addresses...,” as recited in claim 42.

The Bartholomew reference similarly fails to teach or disclose a parsing router. This reference uses a standard router and does not mention parsing:

According to the instant embodiment of the invention the remote Voice Mail Systems (VMS) are handled as remote LANs. Each of these LANs is connected to the Internet over an interface or gateway connection with a standard LAN environment (IEEE 802.3, 802.4, 802.5) over a LLC (logical link control) utilizing CSMA/CD, token ring, token bus, or the like. The LLC procedure is that part of the protocol that governs the assembling of DLL frames and their exchange between data stations independent of how the transmission medium is shared. The protocol provides transparency to the network layer with respect to the underlying LAN media. The interface includes a conventional IP router or a bridge-like IP router to implement the IP and TCP protocols. By way of example a bridge-like router may comprise a router and function of the type described in Perlman et al. U.S. Pat. No. 5,309,437, entitled "Bridge-Like Internet Protocol Router," issued May 3, 1994, or similar equipment. The Internet itself is linked largely by telephone lines which are mostly T-1 lines.

(Bartholomew et al., col. 27, lines 32-50.)

Applicant submits that neither the LaPorta reference nor the Bartholomew reference teaches or suggests a parsing router, as recited in amended claim 42. Thus, the LaPorta reference in combination with the Bartholomew reference fail to teach or suggest each and every element of amended claim 42. Moreover, both the LaPorta reference and the Bartholomew reference teach away from claim 42 by failing to recognize the need for parsing. Accordingly, claim 42 is believed to be allowable over the cited art.

MS#180500.03 (4947.2)
PATENT

Claims 60 and 65, as amended, include the similar recitals as claim 42 directed to the parsing router. As such, claims 60 and 65 are distinguishable over the LaPorta and Bartholomew references for the same reasons as claim 42 so that the rejections must be withdrawn.

Claims 43-57 depend from claim 42; claims 61-63 depend from claim 60; and claims 66-68 depend from claim 65. These claims should be allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 42, 60, and 65 are allowable.

Response to Arguments

Applicant notes the Response to Arguments in the Office action and respectfully requests reconsideration of the application claims as amended in view of the foregoing remarks. In the event that the Examiner does not allow this application in response to this Amendment E and accompanying Request for Continued Examination, Applicant requests an interview.

An interview request form is attached.

MS#180500.03 (4947.2)
PATENT

CONCLUSION

The other reference made of record and not relied upon is cumulative and no more relevant than the references already applied in the Office action. Thus, the amended claims distinguish over the prior art and are patentable.

It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Office action and, as such, places the application in condition for allowance. Such allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank R. Agovino, Reg. No. 27,416
SENNIGER, POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400